

# UNITED STATES OF AMERICA JUDICIAL PANEL ON MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

**CHAIRMAN:**  
 Judge Wm. Terrell Hodges  
 United States District Court  
 Middle District of Florida

**MEMBERS:**  
 Judge John F. Keenan  
 United States District Court  
 Southern District of New York

Judge J. Frederick Motz  
 United States District Court  
 District of Maryland

Judge Bruce M. Selya  
 United States Court of Appeals  
 First Circuit

Judge Robert L. Miller, Jr.  
 United States District Court  
 Northern District of Indiana

Judge D. Lowell Jensen  
 United States District Court  
 Northern District of California

Judge Kathryn H. Vratil  
 United States District Court  
 District of Kansas

Robert A. Cahn  
 Executive Attorney

**DIRECT REPLY TO:**

Michael J. Beck  
 Clerk of the Panel  
 One Columbus Circle, NE  
 Thurgood Marshall Federal  
 Judiciary Building  
 Room G-255, North Lobby  
 Washington, D.C. 20002

Telephone: [202] 502-2800  
 Fax: [202] 502-2888

<http://www.jpml.uscourts.gov>

June 9, 2004

**TO ALL INVOLVED JUDGES**

**Re: MDL-1629 -- In re Neurontin Marketing and Sales Practices Litigation**

(See Attached Schedule of Actions)

Dear Judges:

Presently before the Panel pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407 is a motion to transfer including at least one action before you in the above-described docket. The parties will have an opportunity to fully brief the question of transfer and the matter will be considered at a bimonthly Panel hearing session. The purpose of this letter is to apprise you of the effect of the pendency of the action before the Panel. Panel Rule 1.5, 199 F.R.D. 425, 427 (2001), provides:

The pendency of a motion, order to show cause, conditional transfer order or conditional remand order before the Panel concerning transfer or remand of an action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407 does not affect or suspend orders and pretrial proceedings in the district court in which the action is pending and does not in any way limit the pretrial jurisdiction of that court.

Thus your jurisdiction continues until any transfer ruling becomes effective. If you have a motion pending before you in the action – particularly a motion to remand to state court (if the action was removed to your court) – you are encouraged to rule on the motion unless you conclude that the motion raises issues likely to arise in other actions in the transferee court, should we order transfer, and would best be decided there.

Please feel free to contact our staff in Washington with any questions.

Kindest regards,

Wm. Terrell Hodges  
 Chairman

Attachment

**SCHEDULE OF ACTIONS  
DOCKET NO. 1629  
IN RE NEURONTIN MARKETING AND SALES PRACTICES LITIGATION**

Eastern District of Louisiana

*Emma B. Christina v. Pfizer, Inc., et al.*, C.A. No. 2:04-1450 (Judge Carl J. Barbier)

*Debra Mull, etc. v. Pfizer, Inc., et al.*, C.A. No. 2:04-1489 (Judge Jay C. Zainey)

District of Massachusetts

*The Guardian Life Insurance Co. of America v. Pfizer, Inc., et al.*, C.A. No. 1:04-10739 (Judge Patti B. Saris)

*Aetna, Inc. v. Pfizer, Inc., et al.*, C.A. No. 1:04-10958 (Judge Patti B. Saris)

*Harden Manufacturing Corp. v. Pfizer, Inc., et al.*, C.A. No. 1:04-10981 (Judge Patti B. Saris)

*Teamsters Health & Welfare Fund of Philadelphia & Vicinity v. Pfizer Inc., et al.*, C.A. No. 1:04-10984

(Judge Patti B. Saris)

District of New Jersey

*ASEA/AFSCME Local 52 Health Benefits Trust, et al. v. Pfizer, Inc., et al.*, C.A. No. 2:04-2577 (Judge Joel A. Pisano)